

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Summary of Prosecution History:

In the Office Action dated September 12, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5-9, 11, and 12 as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,923,410 to Suzuki (“Suzuki”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,580,034 to Daane et al. (“Daane”). The Examiner also rejected the same claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant responded to this Office Action by submitting an Amendment and Response on November 14, 2005 that canceled claim 6 and amended claims 2, 8, 9, and 11. The Examiner filed an Advisory Action in response to the Amendment and Response on December 12, 2005 denying entry of Applicants’ amendments.

Summary of Response:

Applicants have canceled claims 6, 7 and 12 and have amended claims 2, 8, 9 and 11. Applicants respectfully submit that the currently amended application traverses the rejections of record in the September 12, 2005 Office Action and December 12, 2005 Advisory Action and is in condition for allowance.

REMARKS

I. Introduction

The Examiner argues that Suzuki discloses all of the limitations of claim 2, with the exception of the cable being a coaxial cable (which, *per* currently amended claim 2, is no longer a limitation). Applicants submit that additional limitations of currently amended claim 2 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Suzuki. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the references relied upon by the Examiner, alone or in combination, cannot anticipate or render obvious currently amended claim 2.

II. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest a “dielectric member made from a porous resin material”

Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest the “dielectric member” as described in claim 2. Claim 2 requires that the “structure for connecting an electrical connector to a cable” comprise a “dielectric member made from a porous resin material.” The Examiner asserts that the “dielectric member” is allegedly disclosed by the “joining sheets **51**.” (*See* Office Action, p. 4).

Currently amended claim 2 requires that the “dielectric member” be composed of a “porous resin material” such as polytetrafluoroethylene foam. (*See* ¶ [0021]). Suzuki, however, discloses a “low-permittivity dielectric connector **11**” with a “dielectric sheet of stretched porous polytetrafluoroethylene resin (hereinafter referred to as E-PTFE) **21**” with “a pair of corrugated joining sheets **51**, **51** of polytetrafluoroethylene (hereinafter referred to as PTFE).” (*See* Suzuki, Col. 3, lines 49-64). Thus, the joining sheets **51**, which the Examiner cites as allegedly disclosing the “dielectric member,” are composed of PTFE and not the porous E-PTFE of which

the “low-permittivity dielectric sheet **21**” is composed. Thus, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest a “dielectric member” composed of a “porous resin material” as required by claim 2. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki does not disclose every limitation of claim 2 and thus cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 2.

III. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest an “insulating core sheath”

Applicants further respectfully assert that Suzuki does not disclose or suggest “[a] structure for connecting an electrical connector to a cable, said cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and an insulating core sheath” as required by currently amended claim 2. (emphasis added). Although the Examiner alleges that Suzuki discloses a “cable connecting structure (Figs. 1-4) for connecting an electrical connector (**11**) to a cable (**9**) including cable cores (**104** & **114**) each comprising a core conductor (**104**) and a core sheath (**114**),” (Office Action, p. 4), Suzuki merely discloses a low-permittivity connector **11** for connection to a flat cable **9** having a plurality of rigid plated wires **104** that are sandwiched between *a pair* of PTFE tapes **114**. (See Suzuki, Col. 4, lines 56-64, FIG. 4). In contrast to the Examiner’s assertion, the PTFE tapes cannot even arguably comprise a “sheath” as they are merely a pair of sheets with more than one wire sandwiched between them. A “sheath,” on the other hand, is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as a “tube-like case, covering, or protection.” One skilled in the art of wire connectors would understand a “sheath” to comprise a tube-like casing that surrounds a single wire, and would further understand that a “sheath” is not a pair of sheets with a plurality of wires sandwiched in between. As such, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest *a structure for connecting an electrical connector to a cable, said cable including cable cores each having a core conductor and an insulating core sheath*.

Furthermore, even assuming *arguendo* that Suzuki somehow discloses “cable cores each having a core conductor and an insulating core sheath,” Suzuki does not disclose or suggest that the “cable cores are exposed by peeling a leading end of said cable, *including portions of said insulating core sheaths*” as required by currently amended claim 2. Even assuming that the PTFE tapes **114** are “sheaths,” which they are not, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest that the PTFE tapes **114** are peeled back in order to expose a leading end of the cable **9**. In contrast, Suzuki’s wires **104** are exposed as a result of their being placed between the PTFE tapes, which then undergo a “sintering” process to “to form an insulation layer structure,” resulting in an arrangement in which portions of the wires **104** extend out from between the PTFE tapes. (*See* Suzuki, Col. 4, lines 55-64). Consequently, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest that the *cable cores are exposed by peeling a leading end of said cable, including portions of said insulating core sheaths*. For at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki does not disclose every limitation of claim 2 and thus cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 2.

IV. Suzuki does not Disclose or Suggest a “dielectric member containing an air-filled cavity housing at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable”

Per currently amended claim 2, the “dielectric member” must contain “an air-filled cavity housing at least part of the exposed portions of said cable cores of the cable.” Suzuki, on the other hand, discloses “wires **104** . . . inserted straight, and without losing linearity, into the openings **71** of the housing **61**.” (*See* Office Action, p. 4 (citing Suzuki, Col. 5, lines 16-18)). In contrast to the pending application where all of the exposed portions of the cable cores are in a single air-filled cavity, Suzuki discloses an individual opening **71** for each wire. Because each opening **71** appears to be a self-contained entity, Suzuki fails to disclose or suggest the “exposed


portions of said cable cores of the cable” housed in “an air-filled cavity.” For at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki does not disclose every limitation of claim 2 and thus cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 2.

Daane has been cited against claim 2 only for the teaching of the limitation of a “structure for connecting an electrical connector to a coaxial cable.” (Office Action, page 5). Daane does not disclose or suggest any of the aforementioned features of independent claim 2 missing from Suzuki and has not been so cited. Thus, claim 2 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Suzuki and Daane. Applicants further respectfully submit that, since claims 5, 8, 9, and 11 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 2, and so contain all of its limitation, these dependent claims cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully solicit the allowance of the pending claims. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. If any fees in addition to those transmitted concurrently with this paper are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account Number 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587
(212) 408-2588

David Loretto
PTO Reg. No. 44,374
(212) 408-2584

Attorneys for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112